United Nations A/C.3/58/SR.58

General Assembly
Fifty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
9 December 2003

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 58th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 26 November 2003, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Belinga-Eboutou ..... (Cameroon)

Contents

Agenda item 117: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 106: Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 113: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

03-63823 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Agenda item 117: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/58/L.30/Rev.2, L.78 and L.81)

Draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.30/Rev.2 entitled "The situation of and assistance to Israeli children", and amendments thereto in document A/C.3/58/L.81

1. **Mr. Gillerman** (Israel) announced that his Government was withdrawing the draft resolution, because hostile amendments proposed by the Egyptian and several other delegations would, if adopted, pervert its focus and intent.

2. His delegation had submitted its draft resolution only after the Committee's adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.24, on the situation of and assistance to Palestinian children, since Israeli children deserved equal attention. The very submission of the draft resolution had been a challenge to Member States to avoid selective treatment of Israel and to demonstrate the same compassion for Palestinian and Israeli children alike. The sponsors of the amendments had given their answer. It was puzzling why hundreds of Israeli children killed or maimed in brutal terrorist attacks deserved less sympathy than Palestinian youngsters, or why the suffering of Israeli families trying to cope with loss and tragedy was regarded as less severe than that of Palestinian parents.

3. The submission of the so-called "amendments", which, in fact, altered the whole nature of the draft resolution, was a grossly unfair and mean-spirited act, designed to deny the Committee an opportunity to vote on a draft resolution highlighting the plight of Israeli children. From the perspective of those who had suggested the changes, a resolution expressly recognizing the suffering of Israeli children would have contradicted the view that they had tried to propagate, namely that Israelis were always villains and never victims, that Israelis had responsibilities and no rights and that Palestinians had rights but no responsibilities.

4. The delegations which had backed the Israeli draft resolution had evinced a consistent concern for the welfare of all the world's children, while those which had opposed it had demonstrated the shameless double standards that animated their conduct at the United Nations. As long as that state of affairs was tolerated, it was little wonder that the legitimacy of some General Assembly resolutions was challenged or that the credibility of the United Nations was sometimes questioned. He therefore hoped that his Government's withdrawal of its draft resolution would serve as a wake-up call to delegations and remind them that the General Assembly faced a serious problem in securing its legitimacy with regard to issues related to the conflict in the Middle East. The Third Committee should therefore address the question of children on a fair, equal and universal basis at the next session.

5. **Mr. Roshdy** (Egypt) said that Israel should retract its withdrawal, for the amendments proposed in his delegation's draft resolution did not introduce new language, but merely called for peace for all children in the Middle East and therefore could not be termed "hostile". The United Nations did not have double standards. Unlike Israeli children, who had a Government to protect them, Palestinian children could not even attend school, because tanks surrounded their homes. Well over 500 Palestinian children had been killed in the previous three years. Egypt was not hostile to Israel and had been the first country to sign a peace treaty with Israel. The Israeli delegation should explain why it had found no co-sponsors for its one-sided draft resolution.

6. **Mr. Maaluf** (United States of America) said that his delegation did not want the issue of children to be politicized, or one group of children to be singled out in a given region of the world. Country-specific and group-specific resolutions regarding children were inappropriate. It was therefore to be hoped that, in the future, the Committee would avoid the submission of such resolutions. The draft resolution on Israeli children (A/C.3/58/L.30/Rev.2) had received very different treatment to that on Palestinian children (A/C.3/58/L.24). The former would have redressed the imbalance created by the Committee's adoption of the latter. For that reason, it was unfortunate that hostile amendments would have distorted the draft to such an extent that the sponsor had decided to withdraw it. That episode would bolster the belief that the United Nations continued to be biased in its treatment of the parties and issues related to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.78: Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities

7. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) explained that the statement setting out programme budget implications had not been issued earlier, because time had been needed in order to ascertain the implications of the large number of draft resolutions submitted to the Committee the previous week and in order to consult the substantive departments concerned, as well as the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management. Every effort had been made to obtain and update the requisite information. As for draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.78, an oral statement would be made, followed by an official committee document.

8. **Mr. De Alba** (Mexico) asked why the explanation given during the morning meeting had contradicted the information his delegation had received during consultations on the dates of the meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Working Group. The Secretariat had previously stated that the draft resolution would have no additional financial implications, but that some adjustment of the timetable might prove necessary. The Secretariat should therefore clarify the ambiguity which had arisen. Only once that matter had been resolved, would it be appropriate to take action on the draft resolution and for the Fifth Committee to consider the consequences of any readjustments that had been made. It would not, however, be reasonable to expect further clarification at the current meeting.

9. As coordinator of the sponsors, he said that the phrase "by Member States and observers" should be deleted from paragraph 3 so as to meet the concerns of a number of delegations and to endorse a decision taken by a different body.

10. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) explained that the meeting of the Working Group and the fourth session of the Ad Hoc Committee had not been on the calendar of meetings and conferences in the 2004-2005 biennium. For that reason, provision had to be made for additional requirements in terms of conference services. The dates and number of meetings had altered considerably during the current biennium and so conference-servicing requirements had shifted accordingly. During consultations between his office and the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, it had become clear that the meetings of the two bodies would generate an additional demand for conference services and documents, and would require an additional appropriation in the programme budget for 2004-2005.

11. **Ms. Maillé** (Canada) said that the lateness of the information on programme budget implications was deplorable. She sought confirmation that the amounts quoted were based on a full-cost assessment and that rooms would actually be available on the dates scheduled for the meetings in question.

12. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) replied that it was established practice to base statements of programme budget implications on a full-cost assessment. At that point in time, however, the Secretariat was unable to determine whether extra capacity was available, since it did not have a complete picture of the requirements for the 2004-2005 biennium. It was up to the Fifth Committee to decide on the allocation of resources from the contingency fund.

13. **Mr. Rojas** (Chile) endorsed the comments of the Mexican delegation and pointed out that action was being taken on the draft resolution, although the Committee did not really know if the meetings could actually be held.

14. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on the draft resolution.

15. *Draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.78, as orally revised, was adopted.*

16. **Mr. Fox** (United States of America) said that his Government had intended to join the consensus on the draft resolution, although it had concerns about the pace of the Ad Hoc Committee's work. In the light of the two 10-day sessions called for in the draft resolution, it would be difficult for States and other participants to prepare sufficiently. He endorsed the sentiments of the Mexican and Canadian delegations regarding the programme budget implications and announced that his Government therefore dissociated itself from the consensus. The United Nations had been provided with ample resources to meet the priority needs agreed by Member States and so additional funds for that activity should not be necessary. His delegation would re-examine the issue when it arose in the Fifth

Committee. Nonetheless his Government would continue to participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.

17. **Ms. Maillé** (Canada) said that her delegation likewise reserved the right to discuss the question further in the Fifth Committee.

18. **Mr. Tejima** (Japan) said that his Government regarded the protection and promotion of the rights of persons with disabilities as most important and therefore regretted that the statement on programme budget implications had been given only a few minutes before action had been taken on the draft resolution. He requested the Secretariat to make such statements available earlier and in writing for the sake of greater transparency.

19. **Mr. Andrabi** (Pakistan) stated that, although his Government had joined the consensus, its understanding was that the negotiations concerning the draft convention would be held only among the Member States, Palestine and the Holy See.

20. **Mr. Wood** (United Kingdom) said that the programme budget implications as outlined orally might have called into question his Government's sponsorship of the draft resolution and it would therefore have welcomed an opportunity to speak before action had been taken. As the draft resolution had been adopted, however, his Government would not dissociate itself from the consensus although, as in the previous year, it was unhappy about the lateness of the statement on programme budget implications. In the future, the Secretariat should make those statements available much earlier.

21. **Ms. Mårtensson** (Sweden) expressed concern about the manner in which the Committee had proceeded with regard to the draft resolution, which Sweden had co-sponsored on the understanding that no additional resources would be necessary if the meetings took place at certain times. The rapidity with which the resolution had been adopted had robbed the sponsors of any opportunity to consider the potentially huge attendant costs. Nevertheless Sweden and all other European Union member States were still committed to participation in drafting the convention. The work of the Ad Hoc Committee had not, however, been handled in an appropriate manner by the Secretariat.

22. **Mr. De Alba** (Mexico) said that the decision taken on the draft resolution sent a clear and very important message. He assured delegations worried about the financial implications that his Government would conduct negotiations aimed at solving the problem in the Fifth Committee. It was crucial to review the Organization's working methods in order to understand why the exchange of information among various Secretariat departments had led to so many mistakes. His Government would play an active role in the Committee on Conferences, because the United Nations deserved to have its work arranged in a more efficient manner.

23. **Ms. Espíndola** (Ecuador) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution as a sign of the international community's commitment to the drafting of a comprehensive international convention to protect the rights and dignity of the disabled. Although she recognized the need to take into account programme budget implications, she stressed that protection of the rights of the disabled should also be a priority.

Agenda item 106: Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/58/L.2 and L.48)

Draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.2, entitled "Preparations for the observance of the tenth anniversary of the International Year of the Family in 2004", and amendments thereto in document A/C.3/58/L.48

24. **Mr. De Barros** (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to the amendments to the draft resolution and recalled that further revisions had been made when the amendments had been introduced.

25. With regard to the programme budget implications of the amendments, as orally revised, he said he had been informed by the Programme Planning and Budget Division that, with regard to the new operative paragraph 1 bis, the holding of a regional preparatory conference in Benin in May 2004 in collaboration with the United Nations would constitute an exception to the rules governing the use of United Nations funds for the travel of government representatives. Resources from the United Nations Trust Fund on Family Activities would support the organization of the regional conference; the travel of United Nations staff would also be paid out of the Trust Fund. The regular budget would therefore not bear any of the expenses involved.

26. Regarding the new paragraph 6 bis, he said that, consistent with and in response to the reform efforts of the Secretary-General as reflected in document A/57/387, the Division for Social Policy and Development had been reorganized to allocate resources in accordance with priorities. In responding to legislative mandates, the Division drew upon the skills and expertise of its entire staff. In the area of social integration, that principle applied to the family, ageing, youth and the disabled. The Secretariat would meet the requirements of the programme of work related to the family within existing resources. Furthermore, the actions requested of the Secretary-General in the new paragraph 6 bis, in particular in subparagraphs (ii) and (iii), could be accommodated within the proposed programme budget for 2004-2005 and from extrabudgetary resources to be made available from the United Nations Trust Fund for Family Activities.

27. **The Chairman** said that Angola, Armenia, the Comoros, the Gambia, Haiti, Morocco, Namibia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda and the United States wished to join the sponsors. He said he took it that the Committee wished to approve the amendments in document A/C.3/58/L.48, as orally revised, for incorporation into draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.2.

28. *It was so decided.*

29. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.2, as amended, without a vote.

30. *It was so decided.*

Oral decision concerning document A/58/67-E/2003/49

31. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report on preparations for and observance of the tenth anniversary of the International Year of the Family in 2004 (A/58/67-E/2003/49).

32. *It was so decided.*

33. **Mr. Fox** (United States of America) said it was the understanding of his delegation that the Committee was taking note of the document in question consistent with General Assembly decision 55/488.

34. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 106.

Agenda item 113: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/L.25/Rev.1, L.28 and L.84)

Draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.25/Rev.1: The girl child

35. **The Chairman** announced that the following delegations wished to join the sponsors: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and Uruguay. He added that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

36. **Ms. Muuondjo** (Namibia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that paragraph 16 should end with the word "peacekeepers" and the following words should be deleted.

37. **Ms. Zack** (United States of America) suggested the following amendments to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution: the word "applicable" should be inserted before "human rights instruments" and, at the end of the paragraph, the words "as well as the need for universal application of those instruments" should be replaced with "and invites States to consider ratification of those instruments and their additional protocols". The amendments were intended to recall that States were obligated to implement only those instruments which they had ratified and that it was the sovereign right of every State to decide which instruments it chose to ratify. Although she would not be suggesting any amendments with regard to references in the draft resolution to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, she recalled her delegation's statement during consideration of draft

resolution A/C.3/58/L.85. In spite of her delegation's concerns, however, she stressed that it supported adoption of the draft resolution as a whole by consensus.

38. **Ms. Muuondjo** (Namibia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, stressed the importance of the draft resolution. Although she would have preferred consensus on the draft as a whole, she could not accept the amendments proposed by the United States and therefore called for a recorded vote on those amendments.

39. *A recorded vote was taken*:

In favour:

Colombia, Singapore, United States of America.

Against:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Georgia, Haiti, Honduras, Israel, Papua New Guinea, Uganda.

40. *The United States amendments were rejected by 145 to 3, with 6 abstentions.*

41. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.28: Office of the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict

43. **The Chairman** announced that the delegations of Burkina Faso and the Niger wished to join the sponsors, and drew attention to the programme budget implications in document A/C.3/58/L.84.

44. **Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi** (Gabon) said the sponsors were not satisfied with the statement on programme budget implications and requested an explanation from the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division with regard to paragraph 2 of the statement.

45. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) noted that the operative paragraph of the draft resolution recommended that the activities of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict should be supported through regular budgetary funding. Since that recommendation was of a purely budgetary and financial, rather than a substantive, nature, the Division was of the opinion that the matter should be referred to the Fifth Committee, which had authority for decisions relating to administrative and budgetary matters.

46. **Mr. Cabral** (Guinea-Bissau) said that the statement on programme-budget implications (A/C.3/58/L.84) was misleading: rather than containing the financial estimates required under rule 153 of the rules of procedure, it expressed the opinion of the Programme Planning and Budget Division. He

wondered under what rule the attempt was being made to stifle the Committee's discussion. The representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division should provide clarification.

47. **Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.28 had expected document A/C.3/58/L.84 to contain at least seven paragraphs, outlining the background to the situation, the current financial position of the Office of the Special Representative, the activities to be implemented under the proposals and, above all, the administrative and financial implications spelled out in dollars, followed by a summary of the situation as a whole. The Programme Planning and Budget Division should provide a more detailed assessment.

48. **Ms. Khalil** (Egypt) said it was a travesty to claim that draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.28 concerned budgetary matters and was therefore outside the Committee's competence. On the contrary, it concerned the Office of the Special Representative and how he should best carry out his mandate. It was not for the Programme Planning and Budget Division to determine which draft resolutions the Committee discussed.

49. **Ms. Mohamed Ahmed** (Sudan) concurred. Document A/C.3/58/L.84 did not set out the programme budget implications but simply stated the obvious. She therefore requested the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division to provide the Committee with any information that he had to hand.

50. **Mr. Andrabi** (Pakistan), supported by **Ms. Al Haj Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic) and **Mr. Zhang** Lei (China), said it was unprecedented in his experience that the Programme Planning and Budget Division should take three weeks to produce a document that contained not the programme budget implications but a mere opinion. The Committee needed a real estimate of the expenditure involved before it could vote on the draft resolution.

51. **Mr. Owade** (Kenya), supported by **Mrs. Oubida** (Burkina Faso), said that, in issuing document A/C.3/58/L.84, the Secretariat had abdicated its responsibilities. He therefore proposed that the Committee should take action on draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.28 with the information already at its disposal.

52. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.28 had been the subject of extensive consultation within the Secretariat. It had been decided that the best course of action was to draw the Committee's attention to the complexity of the situation: the Fifth Committee would, in the current circumstances, find it difficult to approve a proposal for regular funding of the Office of the Special Representative. As for the specific question of the financial implications of the draft resolution, it had been estimated that there would be a requirement of $4 million to $6 million from the regular budget.

53. **Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone), supported by **Mr. Cabral** (Guinea-Bissau) and **Ms. Mohamed Ahmed** (Sudan), said that the figures provided by the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division were of little assistance without some background information. Much would depend on whether, for example, two posts would be required or 15. The Committee was aware of the procedure involved, but it needed specific figures and details on which to base its decision.

54. **Ms. Astanah Banu** (Malaysia), supported by **Ms. Al Haj Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic) and **Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi** (Gabon), after expressing surprise that the Programme Planning and Budget Division had taken three weeks to produce a document containing no programme budget implications, said that, in the interests of economy, the sponsors had restricted the number of operative paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.3/58/L.28. The number of paragraphs was, however, immaterial: the Programme Planning and Budget Division had been required to provide information only on the financial implications of the proposal. It was also misleading to suggest that the Fifth Committee would consider the issue in the absence of a recommendation from the Third Committee; it never took the initiative in such cases. She therefore supported the proposal by the representatives of Kenya and the Sudan that the Committee should take immediate action on the basis of the figure of $4 million to $6 million, in the expectation that the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division would in due course provide more detailed information.

55. **Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi** (Gabon), after announcing that Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic

Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, the Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, the Sudan, Swaziland, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia had become sponsors of the draft resolution, announced a number of revisions. In the first preambular paragraph, the word "created" should be replaced by the word "established" and, in the second, the word "*Appreciating*" by the words "*Taking note of*". A new preambular paragraph should then be inserted, with the following wording:

> "*Recalling* its resolution 57/190 of 18 December 2002 in which it requested the Secretary-General to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the scope and effectiveness of the United Nations system of response, including recommendations for strengthening, mainstreaming, integrating and sustaining these activities, to the issue of children affected by armed conflict".

56. The next preambular paragraph — which had previously been the third but had become the fourth — should be followed by two new preambular paragraphs, with the following wording:

> "*Recognizing* the progress achieved since the establishment of the mandate of the Special Representative and the recommendation by which the Secretary-General extended the mandate of the Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict for a further period of three years,
>
> "*Commending* the support for and the voluntary contributions by donor countries to the work of the Special Representative in the fulfilment of his mandate".

57. The remaining two preambular paragraphs and paragraph 1 would remain unchanged. A new paragraph 2 would have the following wording:

> "2. *Urges* the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict during his mandate to visit those areas that are specified in his report as having not been visited yet where the situation of children continues to be grave."

58. **Ms. Groux** (Switzerland) said that she was concerned at the way in which attempts were being made to adopt the draft resolution without taking account of the requirement in rule 153 of the rules of procedure of an estimate of expenditures. She requested the Chairman to clarify the procedure to be followed.

59. **Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone), said that, while he recognized the efforts of the Programme Planning and Budget Division, in the absence of a written statement on the programme budget implications, the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division should make an oral statement, providing the details requested, including information on the financial situation of the Office of the Special Representative. It was undoubtedly crucial for the Programme Planning and Budget Division to inform the Committee on the financial implications.

60. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme, Planning and Budget Division) said that he did not yet have such detailed information, but assured the Committee that his office would provide a written statement at a later stage. He could, however, confirm that the estimate amounted to $5.6 million.

61. **The Chairman** asked whether the written statement could be presented by the end of the current work day.

62. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said he could not make such a commitment, given the lateness of the hour.

63. **Mr. Rojas** (Chile) suggested that the Committee should adopt the approach taken on a previous occasion, namely, to take a decision based on the assumption that the Fifth Committee would later review the budgetary aspects of the issue.

64. **Ms. Ramírez** (Costa Rica), supporting that proposal, said that in order to avoid further delays, the Committee should take action on the draft resolution.

65. **Ms. Groux** (Switzerland) noted that the example cited by the representative of Chile had been extremely detailed, unlike the present case. She believed the Committee should be given further documentation on how the estimate of $5.6 million had been arrived at.

66. **Ms. Mohamed Ahmed** (Sudan) joined previous speakers in their request for the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division to make an oral statement on the programme budget implications, or to indicate when the Committee could expect to receive a written statement.

67. **Mr. Andrabi** (Pakistan) said that the Committee could deduce that the expected budget outlay ranged from $4 million to $6 million. It was therefore possible to take a decision on the draft resolution since, at the present stage, the Committee was simply considering the need for the Office of the Special Representative to be provided with such resources. Even in the absence of a precise figure the Committee would be able to take appropriate action, leaving the budgetary and financial aspects to be considered in other forums.

68. **Mr. Konfourou** (Mali) said he believed that the current process of presenting the programme budget implications lacked transparency.

69. **Mr. Schurti** (Liechtenstein), following on the statement made by the delegation of Switzerland, asked whether the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division would be able to provide a written statement by Friday, 28 November.

70. **Ms. Zack** (United States of America) said her delegation agreed, that the matter should be referred to the Fifth Committee for appropriate consideration, as stated in document A/C.3/58/L.84. Under rule 153 of the rules of procedure, in order for the Committee to proceed with the consideration of the draft resolution, a more detailed statement on the programme budget implications was imperative.

71. **Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone) repeated his proposal that the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division should make an oral statement on the programme budget implications, and that a written statement would later be issued for consideration by the Fifth Committee.

72. **Ms. Chatsis** (Canada) shared the concerns of various delegations, including Switzerland, the United States and Liechtenstein, with respect to taking further action without a detailed statement on the programme budget implications. It was clear that the central issue of the draft resolution fell within the competence of the Fifth Committee. Further details to establish the basis on which calculations had been made were therefore crucial. In that regard, her delegation was interested in knowing whether the stated estimate had been based on the current or future needs of the Office of the Special Representative.

73. **Mr. Choi** (Australia) said that his delegation supported the statement made by the representative of Canada. He noted that the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division had undertaken to provide a written statement. Despite concerns about punctuality in the presentation of such statements, in his opinion the Programme Planning and Budget Division should be accorded due courtesy to provide the statement at the earliest stage possible.

74. **Ms. Astanah Banu** (Malaysia) said her delegation deeply regretted the manner in which the debate had evolved. The Programme Planning and Budget Division had been granted more than three weeks in which to provide a statement on programme budget implications, and it was therefore now incumbent upon the Division to reciprocate that courtesy by furnishing an appropriate document that would enable the Committee to take further action. Her delegation wished to have a clear reply on the prognosis for the delivery of the awaited statement, since it was imperative to take action on the draft resolution.

75. **Mr. Andrabi** (Pakistan) said that he fully agreed with the Malaysian representative regarding the need for an estimate of expenditures under rule 153. However, the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division had indeed provided an estimate ranging between $4 million and $6 million. It was therefore within the competence of the Committee to act on that basis.

76. **Mr. Felix** (Dominican Republic) said he supported the proposal made earlier by the representative of Chile. The Committee should take action on the draft resolution, bearing in mind the $5.6 million estimate indicated by the Programme Planning and Budget Division.

77. **Mr. Mulyana** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that in the new paragraph 2 proposed by Gabon, either the phrase "with the consent of the host country" or the phrase "upon the invitation of the host country" should be added to the end of the sentence.

78. **Ms. Mohamed Ahmed** (Sudan) reiterated her delegation's deep concern and said that it was incomprehensible why the statement on programme budget implications varied from the ones normally presented. She again asked when the Programme Planning and Budget Division would provide the information requested.

79. **Ms. Groux** (Switzerland) said that, if the matter were referred to the Fifth Committee for consideration, the Third Committee would no longer be bound by rule 153 of the rules of procedure. She therefore suggested that an oral decision would suffice.

80. **Ms. Zack** (United States of America) supported the proposal made by Switzerland. However, if the Committee decided to proceed, her delegation wished to reiterate its position on the requirement for a written statement on programme budget implications.

81. **Ms. Ramírez** (Costa Rica), supported by **Mr. Cabral** (Guinea-Bissau), noted that the programme budget implications would be discussed later in the plenary Assembly. Consequently, there was no impediment to adopting the draft resolution at the current meeting.

82. **Ms. Khalil** (Egypt) said her delegation believed that the Committee should not defer the matter to the Fifth Committee for action. She further insisted that the Programme Planning and Budget Division should make a commitment to present a detailed statement at the next meeting of the Committee.

83. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) stated that he was unable to make a commitment regarding the timing of the statement on programme budget implications, and would need to engage in further consultations.

84. **Ms. Al Haj Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic) expressed the deep concern of her delegation that the Programme Planning and Budget Division could not respond to the Committee's request. It seemed unacceptable that the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division, having stated the specific sum of $5.6 million, would be unable to provide an estimate by the next meeting.

85. **Mr. Rowe** (Sierra Leone) said he wondered whether the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division would be willing to make a formal statement along the lines of his delegation's earlier proposal.

86. In response to a request by **Ms. Astanah Banu** (Malaysia), the Chairman said that the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division had followed the discussions of the Committee with keen interest, and was aware of the prevailing sentiment. He urged the Programme Planning and Budget Division to provide a document on the programme budget implications, rather than a document based on estimates. Failure to do so by Friday, 28 November, would encourage the Committee to act in the manner it deemed appropriate.

87. **Ms. Mohamed Ahmed** (Sudan) assured the Chairman that all delegations would assume their responsibility in taking the action on the draft resolution at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.